



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/758,645	01/10/2001	Jeffrey Allen Hamilton	007216-7	9524
36234	7590	12/14/2004	EXAMINER	
THE MCCALLUM LAW FIRM, LLC			TANG, SON M	
132 KOLAR COURT			ART UNIT	
ERIE, CO 80516			PAPER NUMBER	
			2632	

DATE MAILED: 12/14/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/758,645	JEFREY ALLEN HAMILTON	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Son M Tang	2632	

All Participants:
Status of Application: Non-Final

 (1) Son M Tang.

(3) _____.

 (2) Ms. Marshall.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 2 December 2004
Time: 2:00pm
Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

 Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

 DANIEL WU
 SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Applicant had noted that the 2nd non-final office action mailed on July 15 2004 is the same as the 1st non-final office action mailed on October 27 2003, Examiner realized that 2nd office action as a defective office action. Therefore, the 2nd non-final office action is vacate and a new non-final office action is forth coming..